University of Nebraska - Lincoln
DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Educational Administration: Theses, Dissertations, and Student Research

Educational Administration, Department of

5-1-2011

A Descriptive Analysis of Demographic Characteristics and Their Influence on Student Attendance at Programming Board Events

Kayla Person
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, kayla.person@hotmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedaddiss

Part of the Higher Education Administration Commons

Person, Kayla, "A Descriptive Analysis of Demographic Characteristics and Their Influence on Student Attendance at Programming Board Events" (2011). *Educational Administration: Theses, Dissertations, and Student Research*. Paper 69.
http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedaddiss/69

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational Administration, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Administration: Theses, Dissertations, and Student Research by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

A Descriptive Analysis of Demographic Characteristics and Their Influence on Student Attendance at Programming Board Events

by

Kayla Person

A THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Major: Educational Administration

Under the Supervision of Professor James V. Griesen

Lincoln, Nebraska

May, 2011

A Descriptive Analysis of Demographic Characteristics and Their Influence on Student Attendance at Programming Board Events

Kayla Person, M.A.

University of Nebraska, 2011

Adviser: James V. Griesen

The purpose of this study was to analyze selected demographic characteristics of students who attended programming board events at a medium size, four-year, public institution located in the upper Midwest to determine if statistically significant differences were present between attendees and the full-time undergraduate population. The study tested for: (a) significant differences in the demographic characteristics of full-time undergraduate students who attended one or more programming board events versus full-time undergraduate students who did not attend programming board events, (b) significant differences in the demographic characteristics of students who attended more than one programming board event versus those who attended only one event and (c) significant differences in the demographic characteristics of students who attended only entertainment events verses those students who attended only educational events. Utilizing Chi-Square test analyses to test the hypotheses, the researcher found that demographic characteristics could influence students' attendance patterns at programming board events. The results illustrate the need for additional research on programming board plannig and the students who attend these events.

Acknowledgements

There are many people that I would like to thank for helping me through this process. To my South Dakota State University support team whose continued support and encouragement has propelled me to places I never could have imagined. I would also like to thank the faculty of the Education Administration Department at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln for their wisdom and insight into the field of higher education. To my adviser, Dr. James Griesen, I would like to express my sincere appreciation for the countless hours spent helping me through the process of writing my thesis and for encouraging me to be a part of the Education Administration program. To Dr. Barbara LaCost, my second reader, I extend appreciation for helping me pick a research topic and for making my project the best it could be. I am also grateful to my fellow graduate students for befriending me and helping push me to become a better student and a better professional. Similarly, to my friends, provided their continued support, loyalty, and most importantly, friendship. I am especially grateful to my close friend, Amanda Settje, for her daily words of encouragement. Finally, I thank my family; nothing can replace the love, support, and encouragement you have given me.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1—Introduction 1

Background 1

Purpose…. 2

Research Questions 2

Research Hypotheses 3

Definitions 5

Student fee-funded activities 5

Programming board 5

Entertainment events 5

Educational events 6

Delimitations 6

Limitations 6

Significance 7

Chapter 2—Literature Review 9

Student Involvement Theories 9

Who is more likely to participate? 13

Gender. 13

Ethnicity 14

Class standing 15

Campus residence 16

College of enrollment 17

Type of Involvement 17

Summary 18

Chapter 3—Research Design 19

Purpose 19

Research Questions 19

Research Hypotheses 20

Population.. 22

Variables 23

Data Collection Procedure 25

Obtaining Data 26

Statistical Tests 26

Chapter 4—Results 28

Discussion 28

Research Question #1 29

Null Hypothesis 1 29

Null Hypothesis 2 30

Null Hypothesis 3 31

Null Hypothesis 4 32

Null Hypothesis 5 33

Null Hypothesis 6 34

Research Question #2 35

Null Hypothesis 7 35

Null Hypothesis 8 36

Null Hypothesis 9 37

Null Hypothesis 10 38

Null Hypothesis 11 39

Null Hypothesis 12 40

Research Question #3 41

Null Hypothesis 13 41

Null Hypothesis 14 42

Null Hypothesis 15 43

Null Hypothesis 16 44

Null Hypothesis 17 45

Null Hypothesis 18 46

Summary 47

Chapter 5—Discussion 48

Purpose…. 48

Discussion 48

Research Question #1 48

Research Question #2 52

Research Question #3 54

Recommendations for Further Research 57

Final Conclusion 58

References ….. 60

Appendices 64

List of Tables

Table 1 Description of Participants' Characteristics by Group 24

Table 2 Event Attendance Frequency 25

Table 3 Event Type Frequency 25

Table 4 Hypothesis 1 Results 30

Table 5 Hypothesis 2 Results..... 30

Table 6 Hypothesis 3 Results..... 31

Table 7 Hypothesis 4 Results..... 32

Table 8 Hypothesis 5 Results..... 33

Table 9 Hypothesis 6 Results..... 34

Table 10 Hypothesis 7 Results..... 35

Table 11 Hypothesis 8 Results..... 36

Table 12 Hypothesis 9 Results..... 37

Table 13 Hypothesis 10 Results..... 38

Table 14 Hypothesis 11 Results..... 39

Table 15 Hypothesis 12 Results..... 40

Table 16 Hypothesis 13 Results..... 41

Table 17 Hypothesis 14 Results..... 42

Table 18 Hypothesis 15 Results..... 43

Table 19 Hypothesis 16 Results..... 44

Table 20 Hypothesis 17 Results..... 45

Table 21 Hypothesis 18 Results..... 46

Table 22 Summary of Findings..... 47

List of Appendices

Appendix A IRB Approval Letter 64

Appendix B Event Descriptions 67

Chapter One

Introduction

Background

Astin (1984,1999), Pace (1984) and Kuh (2001), were among the first to study the importance of student co-curricular involvement and the benefits of involvement to the student using student involvement and engagement models. Astin (1999) first introduced his theory of student involvement in 1984, explaining that students learn by becoming involved. He theorized that the amount of learning and personal development is directly proportional to the energy one invests. "It is not so much what the individual thinks or feels, but what the individual does, how he or she behaves, that defines and identifies involvement" (p. 519).

Astin's student involvement theory has a history in college dropout research conducted in the 1970s. Researchers sought to identify factors in the college environment that affected students' persistence. "As it turned out, the things that facilitated persistence all signified high involvement: full-time attendance, participation in extracurricular activities, studying hard, living on campus, and interacting frequently with other students and with faculty" (Astin, 1985, p. 37). In contrast, factors that were associated with dropping out, such as, part-time attendance, living at home, and infrequent studying, signified non-involvement.

There are many opportunities for students to become involved on college campuses and the focus institution of this study is just one example. Additionally, there are numerous entertainment events and educational events for students to attend and participate in throughout the year. In this study, the researcher explored demographic

characteristics of students who attended entertainment and educational events versus those who did not.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to analyze selected demographic characteristics of students who attended programming board events at a medium size, four-year, public institution located in the upper Midwest and to assess whether there are statistically significant differences between attendees and non-attendees in the full-time undergraduate population. Six specific characteristics were analyzed: gender, class standing, college of enrollment, home state, on/off campus residency and ethnicity. By learning more about the characteristics of attendees at events, programming boards and various other student fee-funded programming entities will be better equipped to make informed programming decisions.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed:

1. Are the demographic characteristics of students who attend student fee-funded campus events significantly different from those of the general undergraduate population?
2. Do the students who attend more than one student fee-funded event have significantly different demographic characteristics from those who attend only one event?

3. Are there significant differences in the demographic characteristics of students who attend only entertainment events and those who attend only educational events?

Research Hypotheses

The following six hypotheses relating to the research question one were set forth in the null form to facilitate significance testing.

H_{01}: No significant difference exists between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of gender.

H_{02}: No significant differences exist between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of class standing.

H_{03}: No significant differences exist in event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of their college of enrollment.

H_{04}: No significant difference exists between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of on/off campus residence.

H_{05}: No significant differences exist between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of home state.

H_{06}: No significant differences exist between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of ethnicity.

The following six hypotheses relating to the research question two were set forth in the null form to facilitate significance testing.

H_{07}: No significant difference exists in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of gender.

H_{08}: No significant differences exist in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of class standing.

H_{09}: No significant differences exist in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of their college of enrollment.

H_{10}: No significant difference exists in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of on/off campus residence.

H_{11}: No significant differences exist in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of home state.

H_{12}: No significant differences exist in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of ethnicity.

The following six hypotheses relating to the research question three were set forth in the null form to facilitate significance testing.

H_{13}: No significant difference exists between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of gender.

H_{14}: No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of class standing.

H_{15}: No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of their college of enrollment.

H_{16}: No significant difference exists between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of on/off campus residence.

H_{17}: No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of home state.

H_{18}: No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of ethnicity.

Definitions

Student fee-funded activities. A portion of student's student fee dollars, which are assessed per credit hour, are designated to various student organizations which sponsor events or programming activities.

Programming board. A programming board is the primary programming organization at a university or colleges that plans and implements various events and/or special projects or programs.

Entertainment events. Events hosted by the programming board that are for pure entertainment value. These events include concerts, magicians, and comedians.

Educational events. Events hosted by the programming board that include educational and service learning elements. These events include lectures and fundraising events.

Delimitations

At the time of this study data were available for the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 academic years. Only one year of collected data was analyzed, 2008-2009 because the 2009-2010 data set was incomplete. Additionally, the study focused on full-time undergraduate students because undergraduate students are the target audience for programming board events. The demographic characteristics analyzed in the study were limited to those data readily available in the electronic student information system.

Limitations

In this study the researcher only examined event data that the student members of the programming board collected. As a result, there was some data collection error. Data were not collected for every programming board event for the 2008-2009 year. There were 48 spring events at which attendance data could have been collected but for 33 events data were not collected. Additionally, some students may have attended an event but forgot their ID card or arrived late to the event after programming board coordinators stopped checking for student ID cards, in which case, they would not have been included in the data set. Data collection procedures could have been improved by the programming board coordinators being more vigilant about event attendees swiping their student IDs before entering each event and making sure to secure all collected data.

Even though a student did not attend one or more student programming board events it does not mean that he/she is not an involved student. Involvement can take on multiple forms, and an institution may provide many options for student participation in on-campus and off-campus activities. For example, a student could be actively involved in an academic organization, an intramural sports team, a social fraternity or sorority, or community service projects.

The demographic characteristics, as they relate to the students, were collected in the fall 2008 by the study institution's admissions and registration offices. Some demographic characteristics are subject to change from term to term (e.g., college of enrollment and on/off campus residency).

Significance

The results of this study are significant because they contribute knowledge to the field of student involvement and they identify those demographic characteristics of students that are related to attendance of student fee-funded programming board events. Although there have been numerous articles regarding student involvement and the benefits of involvement for the student, there have been limited research studies conducted on the demographic characteristics of students that attend student programming board events. The results of this research study will help student organizations select their programming options and choose wiser advertising methods.

Although the sample was small, findings from this study provided insights to basic demographic characteristics and event attendance tendencies of full-time undergraduate students at student fee-funded programming board events. Direct beneficiaries of this

study are programming boards and student organizations that plan programming events at various institutions who can knowledge from the attendance tendencies of their audiences. Furthermore, the results of the study could help student programming boards and other student organizations better understand the programming needs of their student population.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

Broadly defined, involvement can be interrupted differently depending on the researchers, and is similar to related concepts of integration and engagement. No matter what it is titled, "research has consistently shown that the more students are active on campus and the more they feel a part of campus life, the more likely they are to have positive outcomes such as cognitive gains, satisfaction, and retention" (Sharkness & DeAngelo, 2010, p. 1). Astin (1984) described an involved student as one who "devotes considerable energy to studying, spends much time on campus, participates actively in student organizations, and interacts frequently with faculty members and other students" (p. 297).

Although these characterizations provide a general description of an involved student, it is helpful to review the research findings that support them. The current literature describes student involvement theories and provides insight into which students within a university are more likely to participate in various forms of involvement opportunities.

Student Involvement Theories

There are multiple studies involving student participation in co-curricular activities, but little current research on the demographic characteristics of students that participate in student fee-funded activities. Although student involvement is of the more widely studied areas in higher education, the most popular and most widely explored theory concerned with student involvement outcomes is Astin's theory of student involvement (1984,1999).

Astin's (1984,1999) theory of student involvement describes the "quantity and quality of the physical and psychological energy that students invest in the college experience. This involvement takes many forms, such as absorption in academic work, participation in extracurricular activities, and interaction with faculty and other personnel" (Astin, 1999, p. 528). Student involvement theory is equally applicable to both students and faculty making Astin's theory easy to be used by researchers "to guide their investigation of student and faculty development, and by college administrators and faculty as they attempt to design more effective learning environments" (Astin, 1985, p. 36). Many empirical studies of college outcomes, including Astin's student involvement theory, suggest that the greater the degree of involvement in the academic and social aspects of campus life, the greater the benefit to the students in terms of learning and personal development (Chang & Huang, 2004, p. 391). Astin's (1984,1999) theory of student involvement includes five postulates:

> 1. Involvement refers to the investment of physical and psychological energy in various objects. The objects may be highly generalized (the student experience) or highly specific (preparing for a chemistry examination).
>
> 2. Regardless of its object, involvement occurs along a continuum; that is, different students manifest different degrees of involvement in a given object, and the same student manifests different degrees of involvement in different objects at different times.
>
> 3. Involvement has both quantitative and qualitative features. The extent of a student's involvement in academic work, for instance, can be measured quantitatively (how many hours the student spends studying) and qualitatively (whether the student reviews and comprehends reading assignments or simply stares at the textbook and daydreams).
>
> 4. The amount of student learning and personal development associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement in that program.

> 5. The effectiveness of any educational policy or practice is directly related to the capacity of that policy or practice to increase student involvement. (Astin, 1984, p. 298)

Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) reaffirmed Astin's original finding that the influence of college is determined by the individual student and the student's level of involvement in the curricular and co-curricular opportunities on campus. Additionally, "several studies have consistently shown that involvement in out-of-class activities has a positive influence on college persistence, bachelor's degree attainment, educational aspirations, and graduate school attendance" (Chang & Huang, 2004, p. 394).

Astin places a critical role on the institution, suggesting that an institution needs to offer students a wide variety of academic and social opportunities to become involved with new ideas, people, and experiences (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005, p. 53). Although the institution may be integral to a student's success, it is the individual student's responsibility to determine his or her success. "Change is likely to occur only to the extent that the student capitalizes on opportunities and becomes involved, actively exploiting the opportunities to change or grow that the environment presents" (pp. 53-54).

Astin's theory of student involvement has its basis in the previous research of Pace who developed research instruments to assess the quality of effort students put towards their various activities versus the quantity of activities in which students are involved (Astin, 1999, p. 527). Students are accountable for the "amount, scope, and quality of effort they invest" in their education and using the opportunities offered by the university (Pace, 1984, p. 6). "Accountability for achievement and related student outcomes must consider both what the institution offers and what the students do with those offerings"

(pp. 6-7). Pace used 14 scales comprised of activities reflecting increasing levels of effort and potential value to measure the quality of college student experiences in his College Student Experiences Questionnaire. In a four-year study, 1979 through 1982, of 14,615 students at 62 colleges, Pace found that students who were most satisfied with college put the most effort into college and got the most out of college. He reported that regardless of type of college attended, there are few differences in student participation in student activities; the more activities in which a student participates at an above-average level of quality of effort, more above-average progress towards goals of higher education or objectives.

Recently Kuh (2001) reported that the level of engagement in educationally purposeful activities is the best predictor of learning and personal development for students. Kuh used the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), which is specifically designed to assess the extent to which students are engaged in empirically derived good educational practices and what they gain from their college experiences (p. 2). The College Student Report, which is the main content of the NSSE instrument, "represents student behaviors that are highly correlated with many desirable learning and personal development outcomes of college" (p. 2).

The NSSE is a national survey administered in the spring academic term in participating colleges and universities. Students of first-year standing and senior standing are chosen at random and asked to complete the survey. The College Student Report "asks students to report the frequency with which they engage in dozens of activities that represent good educational practice, such as using the institution's human resources, curricular programs, and other opportunities for learning and development that the

college provides" (Kuh, 2001, p. 2). Studying students' levels of engagement in educationally purposeful activities is important because their level of engagement has great benefits to student learning and student success while in college (Pike & Kuh, 2005, pp. 185-186). Kuh has used the NSSE to assess student engagement and has developed a theory of student engagement similar to those of Pace and Astin. All three theories are based on the premise that "students learn from what they do in college" (p. 186).

Who is more likely to participate?

Gender. Arboleda, Wang, Shelley and Whalen (2003) studied the key demographic, attitudinal, and environmental variables of 1,186 undergraduate residence hall students at a large Midwestern land-grant university that contributed to student involvement in residential communities. They found that males were more involved in residential communities than females, which was attributed to "men's greater sense of community and belonging through common experiences and frequent interactions" (p. 528). Students of senior status were significantly less involved than students of freshman status, and majority students were found to be more involved than minority students "presumably because of a higher level of comfort with their residence environment" (p. 528). Lastly, students within the engineering college were found to be "more involved than business college members (the baseline for comparison across colleges)" (p. 528).

In studies based on the National Survey for Student Engagement, Kuh (2001) found that there is evidence to suggest that student engagement experiences may differ for young men and women. Hu and Kuh (2002) analyzed self-reported experiences of 50,883 undergraduates at 123 institutions to identify individual and institutional

characteristics associated with varying levels of student engagement in educationally purposeful activities. Unlike Arboleda et al., Hu and Kuh (2002) found females to have a smaller proportion of disengagement relative to males in the study (p. 563). Likewise, Pike, Kuh, and Gonyea (2003) found in a later study that female students were found to have greater social and academic involvement and more positive perceptions of educational gain compared to male students (p. 253).

Ethnicity. Hu and Kuh (2002) found students of other racial and ethnic backgrounds were more likely than whites to be among those engaged in educationally purposeful activities, with the exception of Asian American students (p. 568). Similarly, in their 2003 study, Pike, Kuh, and Gonyea found that being a member of a minority group was positively related to both academic and social involvement (p. 253). Additionally, in a national study of 4,000 first-time college freshmen entering selective colleges and universities, Fischer (2007) found that for minority students, greater involvement in formal social activities, such as school clubs and organizations, was related positively to college grades (p. 144).

Flowers (2004) researched the effects of student involvement on African American college student development. Using data from the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ), 3rd ed., he assessed a sample of 7,923 African American students from 192 postsecondary institutions that participated in the survey between 1990 and 2000. Flowers reported that African American students who looked at the bulletin boards for notices of campus activities events reported positive gains in understanding arts and humanities, personal and social development, thinking and writing skills, and vocational preparation (p. 645). Also, African American students who heard a speaker at the student

union also had positive gains in understanding arts and humanities, understanding science and technology and thinking and writing skills (p. 646).

Lundberg, in a 2007 study on student involvement predictors of Native American student learning, analyzed data from a sample of Native American undergraduates who took the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ), 4th ed. between 1998 and 2001. The sample was taken from a natoinal database of over 20,000 students of which 643 students identified only as 'American Indian or Other Native.' Lundberg found that students make conclusions about institutional emphasis on diversity through observations and interactions with institutional agents. If Native American students perceive an institution to be accepting and diverse, they were more likely to become involved on campus. "As members of university committees, advisors of student organizations, consultants to programming boards, and colleagues with faculty and administrators, student affairs professionals can influence institutional values in very practical ways" (p. 412).

Class standing. The student class that is most heavily recruited for student involvement opportunities on college campuses is freshman students. "The significance of activity involvement may be especially relevant during the transition from high school to college and university life, during which time changes and challenges in personal, academic, and interpersonal domains are common" (Busseri & Rose-Krasnor, 2008, p. 426). Berger and Milem (1999) studied first-time freshmen students in a highly selective, private, residential research university in the Southeast and found that involvement in campus activities in the first year predicted future involvement in activities and was related positively to institutional commitment, integration into campus social and

academic life, and persistence. In Pace's 1984 "quality of effort" study, seniors were shown to have significantly greater intellectual gains than freshman, however, this is to be expected because seniors have been in college longer and are more invested in their courses of study (p. 55).

Campus residence. Arboleda et al. found conflicting results in involvement characteristics, such as gender and ethnicity, compared to studies by Hu and Kuh (2002) and Pike, Kuh and Gonyea (2003), and Fischer (2007). However, Arboleda et al. (2003) in their study of student's involvement in their residence halls found, that "students who are more involved in their living community tend to be more satisfied with their living environment, both academically and socially" (p. 529). Similarly, Astin (1973) and Chickering (1974) found that "living in a campus residence hall was positively related to retention, and this positive effect occurred in all types of institutions and among all types of students regardless of sex, race, ability, or family background" (cited in Astin, 1999, p. 523). In contrast to commuter students, students who reside on campus simply have more time and opportunities to get involved in different areas of campus life. "Indeed, simply by eating, sleeping, and spending their waking hours on the college campus, residential students have a better chance than do commuter students of developing a strong identification and attachment to undergraduate life" (Astin, 1984, p. 302). In addition, "living in a dormitory is positively associated with several other forms of involvement: interaction with faculty, involvement in student government, and participation in social fraternities or sororities" (Astin, 1999, pp. 524-525). In Pace's (1984) study of "quality of effort", he found the biggest differences between students who live on campus versus off-campus were in the estimated gains in personal and social

development. Students who lived on campus reported higher gains in personal and social development than those students that lived off-campus (p. 60).

College of enrollment. Astin (1993) also found that choice of major has the potential to influence involvement in student activities. For example, majoring in business or engineering tends to have negative effects on social activism, whereas majoring in education has positive effects on a Student Life experience (p. 370-371). In his initial study of students "quality of effort" towards student activities, Pace (1984) found that students in "science majors are strikingly more involved in the science lab scale activities than are the Humanities/Arts majors and precisely the opposite is true of the activities related to cultural facilities and writing where the Humanities/Arts majors have much higher scores" (Pace, 1984, p. 34).

Types of Involvement

Not only is on-campus participation important, but involvement can take on many different forms providing many options for student participation in on-campus activities. For example, involvement can be exhibited by students through participation in hall government, interacting with faculty, active membership in academic organizations, participation in an intramural sports team, membership in a social fraternity or sorority, or participation in service learning and community service projects (Astin, 1985; Arboleda et al., 2003; Jones & Hill, 2003).

The Higher Education Research Institute (2001) reported in a 2001 survey that 81% of first-year students had performed volunteer work in the prevoius year. Although participation in volunteer projects while in high school is a good precursor to how often

students will volunteer in college, the Higher Education Research Institute reported in 2001 that only 23.8% of their sample of first-year students indicated that the chances were very good that they would continue to participate in volunteer or community service work during college.

In 2003, Jones and Hill, analyzed data from 24 students at six institutions, who were both involved and not involved in community service projects. The study found that students who were more consistently involved in community service efforts while in high school were more likely to continue participation while in college. Also, participation was most often encouraged by family or friends and made meaningful by teachers or others who explained the importance of community service (p. 534).

Summary

Although, none of the literature presented on demographic characteristics of students who partake of involvement opportunities on campus focused only on programming board attendance, a comparison of the research regarding other forms of involvement provided considerable insights. In student involvement theory, student time and energy are viewed as institutional resources, and the more time a student spends on campus, the more opportunities the student will have to become involved and forge a connection with the university. Based on the literature, demographic characteristics that may affect student involvement include: gender, class standing, college of enrollment (major), on/off campus residency and ethnicity.

Chapter Three

Research Design

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to analyze selected demographic characteristics of students who attended programming board events at a medium size, four-year, public institution located in the upper Midwest and to assess whether there are statistically significant differences between attendees and non-attendees in the full-time undergraduate population. Six specific characteristics were analyzed: gender, class standing, college of enrollment, home state, on/off campus residency and ethnicity. By learning more about the characteristics of attendees at events, programming boards and various other student fee-funded programming entities will be better equipped to make informed programming decisions.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed:

1. Are the demographic characteristics of students who attend student fee-funded campus events significantly different from those of the general undergraduate population?
2. Do the students who attend more than one student fee-funded event have significantly different demographic characteristics from those who attend only one event?

3. Are there significant differences in the demographic characteristics of students who attend only entertainment events and those who attend only educational events?

Research Hypotheses

The following six hypotheses relating to the research question one were set forth in the null form to facilitate significance testing.

H_{01}: No significant difference exists between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of gender.

H_{02}: No significant differences exist between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of class standing.

H_{03}: No significant differences exist in event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of their college of enrollment.

H_{04}: No significant difference exists between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of on/off campus residence.

H_{05}: No significant differences exist between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of home state.

H_{06}: No significant differences exist between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of ethnicity.

The following six hypotheses relating to the research question two were set forth in the null form to facilitate significance testing.

H_{07}: No significant difference exists in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of gender.

H_{08}: No significant differences exist in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of class standing.

H_{09}: No significant differences exist in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of their college of enrollment.

H_{10}: No significant difference exists in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of on/off campus residence.

H_{11}: No significant differences exist in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of home state.

H_{12}: No significant differences exist in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of ethnicity.

The following six hypotheses relating to the research question three were set forth in the null form to facilitate significance testing.

H_{13}: No significant difference exists between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of gender.

H_{14}: No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of class standing.

H_{15}: No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of their college of enrollment.

H_{16}: No significant difference exists between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of on/off campus residence.

H_{17}: No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of home state.

H_{18}: No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of ethnicity.

Population

The study population consisted of 8,349 undergraduate students who were enrolled full-time (12 or more credit hours), at a medium size, four-year, public institution located in the upper Midwest during the 2008-2009 academic year. The study population was divided into two groups: (a) those undergraduate students who attended one or more of the campus programming board's events during the 2008-2009 academic year (n=1,829), and (b) those undergraduate students who did not attend one or more of the campus programming board's events during the 2008-2009 academic year (n=6,504).

Variables

The variables in this research study consisted of six demographic characteristics: gender, class standing, college of enrollment, home state, on/off campus residence and ethnicity. Additional variables were the type of event attended (entertainment or educational) and the number of events attended in the 2008-2009 academic year. The number and percentages of attendees and non-attendees in each demographic characteristic are presented in Table 1. The attendance frequencies, by number of events and by type of events, are presented in Table 2 and Table 3. A description of the events studied can be seen in Appendix B.

Table 1
Description of Participants Characteristics by Group

Variable name	Group	Number		%	
		Attendees	Non-Attendees	Attendees	Non-Attendees
Gender	Female	1087	2937	27.08%	73.17%
	Male	741	3594	17.09%	82.91%
Class standing	Freshman	936	2019	31.68%	68.32%
	Sophomore	426	1404	23.28%	76.72%
	Junior	238	1398	14.55%	85.45%
	Senior	213	1715	11.05%	88.95%
College of Enrollment	College of Arts and Sciences	535	1318	28.87%	71.13%
	College of Agriculture and Biological Sciences	269	1734	13.43%	86.57%
	College of Education and Counseling	14	59	19.18%	80.82%
	College of Engineering	263	1017	20.55%	79.45%
	College of Family & Consumer Sciences	168	528	24.14%	75.86%
	College of General Studies	263	738	26.27%	73.73%
	College of Nursing	193	767	20.10%	79.90%
	College of Pharmacy	123	310	28.41%	71.59%
Home state	IA	143	452	24.03%	75.97%
	MN	381	1223	23.75%	76.25%
	NE	43	186	18.78%	81.22%
	SD	1149	4229	21.36%	78.64%
	Other	111	351	24.03%	75.97%
Campus Residency	Off Campus	566	4378	11.45%	88.55%
	On Campus	1262	2143	37.06%	62.94%
Ethnicity	American Indian/Alaska Native	14	120	10.45%	89.55%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	33	34	49.25%	50.75%
	Black, non-Hispanic	12	58	17.14%	82.86%
	Hispanic	10	43	18.87%	81.13%
	White, non-Hispanic	1635	5774	22.07%	77.93%
	Non-resident alien	18	63	22.22%	77.78%
	Other/Unknown	106	429	19.81%	80.19%

Table 2
Event Attendance Frequency

Number of Events Attended	Number	% of all Attendees
Only one event	1389	75.98%
More than one event	439	24.02%
Total	1828	100.00%

Table 3
Event Type Frequency

Type of Events attended	Number	% of all Attendees
Educational events (only)	269	14.71%
Entertainment events (only)	1120	61.24%
Combination of event types	440	24.06%
Total	1829	100.00%

Data Collection Procedure

The researcher completed the appropriate Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) for protection of human subjects. IRB research approval requests were submitted to the researcher's institution and the study population institution. The event attendance data had been collected by the programming board at each of their events by swiping the student's identification cards. The demographic data were collected by the study institution's admissions and registration offices. After approval was received from both institutions, the event attendance data were obtained from the student programming board office and these data were then matched with the demographic characteristics of the students by the school's institutional research office. All data were entered into an

Excel spreadsheet to facilitate statistical analysis. No data that personally identified individuals in the study samples were stored.

Obtaining Data

A request was made to the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB) at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to approve the use for the programming board's data. The approval was received on January 3, 2011. IRB # 20110110884EP was assigned to this research project (see appendix A). A second request was made to the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB) at the medium, four-year, public institution located in the upper Midwest to approve the use of the programming board's data. The approval was received on January 10, 2010. IRB # IRB-1101006-EXM was assigned to this research projects.

Statistical Tests

The statistical measure used to analyze the data was Pearson's Chi-Square test, the most commonly used type of Chi-square significance test. When wanting to know if "frequency of cases possessing some quality varies among levels of a given factor or among combinations of levels of two or more factors" a chi-square test is appropriate (Preacher, 2001). The main goal of a chi-square test is to show whether there are significant differences between the populations being tested (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2009, p. 619). "To conduct the chi-square test, the researcher enters observed frequencies corresponding to combinations of levels of relevant factors…sums of elements within rows and within columns are then computed" (Preacher, 2001).

A chi-square test is more likely to establish significance if "(1) the relationship is strong, (2) the sample size is large, and/or (3) the number of values of the two associated variables is large" (North Carolina State University, 2009). The results of a chi-square test will usually be reported in a table that shows either the number or percentage of responses or cases in each category (McMillan, 2008, p. 266). "If the number is less than five in any single category, the chi-square test needs to be "corrected" with, what is called, a Yate's correction. This correction statistically adjusts the numbers to get a more valid result" (p. 266).

This chapter provided the methodology used in the study. The following chapter describes the results of the study, and examines each of the hypotheses to determine the study findings.

Chapter Four

Results

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to analyze selected demographic characteristics of students who attended programming board events at a medium size, four-year, public institution located in the upper Midwest and to assess whether there are statistically significant differences between attendees and non-attendees in the full-time undergraduate population. Six specific characteristics were analyzed: gender, class standing, college of enrollment, home state, on/off campus residency and ethnicity. By learning more about the characteristics of attendees at events, programming boards and various other student fee-funded programming entities will be better equipped to make informed programming decisions.

Data were obtained from the student programming board office and these data were then matched with the demographic characteristics of the students by the school's institutional research office for the 2008-2009 academic year.

The following research questions were posed:

1. Are the demographic characteristics of students who attend student fee-funded campus events significantly different from those of the general undergraduate population?
2. Do the students who attend more than one student fee-funded event have significantly different demographic characteristics from those who attend only one event?

3. Are there significant differences in the demographic characteristics of students who attend only entertainment events and those who attend only educational events?

This chapter presents the findings for research question #1, research question #2 and research question #3.

Research Question #1

Are the demographic characteristics of students who attend student fee-funded campus events significantly different from those of the general undergraduate population?

A Pearson's Chi-Square test was utilized to address the first research question and the six hypotheses associated with the first research question.

Null Hypothesis 1. No significant difference exists between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of gender.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing the gender of programming board attendees against programming board non-attendees in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a Chi-square value with a Yates' correction of 119.598 (see Table 4). Since this value produced a significant difference at the .0001 level, the researcher rejected null hypothesis 1. As the attendance percentages indicate, females are more likely to attend fee-funded programming board events than males.

Table 4
Hypothesis 1 Results

Group	Number		%	
	Attendees	Non-Attendees	Attendees	Non-Attendees
Female	1087	2937	27.08%	73.17%
Male	741	3594	17.09%	82.91%
Chi-Square with Yates' value=119.598		df=1		p≤.0001

Null Hypothesis 2. No significant differences exist between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of class standing.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing the class standing of programming board attendees against programming board non-attendees in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value of 353.368 (see Table 5). Since this value produced a significant difference at the .0001 level, the researcher rejected null hypothesis 2. As the attendance percentages indicate, freshmen are more likely to attend fee-funded programming board events than any other class. As indicated by the data, as students advance in class standing, students become less likely to attend fee-funded events.

Table 5
Hypothesis 2 Results

Group	Number		%	
	Attendees	Non-Attendees	Attendees	Non-Attendees
Freshman	936	2019	31.68%	68.32%
Sophomore	426	1404	23.28%	76.72%
Junior	238	1398	14.55%	85.45%
Senior	213	1715	11.05%	88.95%
Chi-Square value=353.368		df=3	p≤.0001	

Null Hypothesis 3. No significant differences exist in event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of their college of enrollment.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing the college of enrollment of programming board attendees against programming board non-attendees in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value of 163.371 (see Table 6). Since this value produced a significant difference at the .0001 level, the researcher rejected null hypothesis 3. As the attendance percentages indicate, students in the College of Arts and Sciences are more likely to attended fee-funded programming board events than any other college.

Table 6
Hypothesis 3 Results

Group	Number		%	
	Attendees	Non-Attendees	Attendees	Non-Attendees
College of Arts and Sciences	535	1318	28.87%	71.13%
College of Agriculture and Biological Sciences	269	1734	13.43%	86.57%
College of Engineering	263	1017	20.55%	79.45%
College of General Studies	263	738	26.27%	73.73%
College of Nursing	193	767	20.10%	79.90%
College of Pharmacy	123	310	28.41%	71.59%
College of Education and Counseling	14	59	19.18%	80.82%
College of Family & Consumer Sciences	168	528	24.14%	75.86%
Chi-Square value=163.371		df=7	$p \leq .0001$	

Null Hypothesis 4. No significant differences exist between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of on/off campus residence.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing the campus residency (on/off campus) of programming board attendees against programming board non-attendees in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value with a Yates' correction of 772.119 (see Table 7). Since this value produced a significant difference at the .0001 level, the researcher rejected null hypothesis 4. As the attendance percentages indicate, on-campus students attended more programming board events than off-campus students.

Table 7
Hypothesis 4 Results

Group	Number		%	
	Attendees	Non-Attendees	Attendees	Non-Attendees
On Campus	1262	2143	37.06%	62.94%
Off Campus	566	4378	11.45%	88.55%
Chi-Square with Yates' value=772.119		df=1		$p \leq .0001$

Null Hypothesis 5. No significant differences exist between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of home state.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing the home state of programming board attendees against programming board non-attendees in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value of 7.991 (see Table 8). Since this value did not produce a significant difference at the .05 level, the researcher failed to reject null hypothesis 5. As the attendance percentages indicate, there were no significant differences in attendance patterns of students from varying states.

Table 8
Hypothesis 5 Results

Group	Number		%	
	Attendees	Non-Attendees	Attendees	Non-Attendees
SD	1149	4229	21.36%	78.64%
MN	381	1223	23.75%	76.25%
IA	143	452	24.03%	75.97%
NE	43	186	18.78%	81.22%
Other	111	351	24.03%	75.97%
Chi-Square value=7.991		df=4	p>.05	

Null Hypothesis 6. No significant differences exist between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of ethnicity.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing the ethnicity of programming board attendees against programming board non-attendees in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value of 42.292 (see Table 9). Since this value produced a significant difference at the .0001 level, the researcher rejected null hypothesis 6. As the attendance percentages indicate, students who identify as Asian/Pacific Islander attended events at a higher percentage compared to the other ethnic groups.

Table 9
Hypothesis 6 Results

Group	Number		%	
	Attendees	Non-Attendees	Attendees	Non-Attendees
White, non-Hispanic	1635	5774	22.07%	77.93%
Asian/Pacific Islander	33	34	49.25%	50.75%
Non-resident alien	18	63	22.22%	77.78%
American Indian/Alaska Native	14	120	10.45%	89.55%
Black, non-Hispanic	12	58	17.14%	82.86%
Hispanic	10	43	18.87%	81.13%
Other/Unknown	106	429	19.81%	80.19%
Chi-Square value=42.292	df=6		$p \leq .0001$	

Research Question #2

Do the students who attend more than one student fee-funded event have significantly different demographic characteristics from those who attend only one event?

A Pearson's Chi-Square test was utilized to address the second research question and the six hypotheses associated with the second research question.

Null Hypothesis 7. No significant differences exist in the demographic characteristics of students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing gender and students who attended one programming board event versus students who attended more than one programming board event in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value with a Yates' correction of .305 (see Table 10). Since this value did not produce a significant difference at the .05 level, the researcher failed to reject null hypothesis 7. As the attendance numbers indicate, the ratio between females and males that attended only one event and females and males that attend more than one event is roughly equal.

Table 10
Hypothesis 7 Results

		Attendance		
		Only one event	More than one event	Total
Gender	F	821	266	1087
	M	568	173	741
Total		1389	439	1828

Yates' value=.305 df=1 p>.05

Null Hypothesis 8. No significant differences exist in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of class standing.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing the class standing demographic characteristic and students who attended one programming board event versus students who attended more than one programming board event in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value of 11.729 (see Table 11). Since this value produced a significant difference at the .05 level, the researcher rejected null hypothesis 8. As the attendance numbers indicte, freshman students attended more than one event compared to students in all other class standings combined.

Table 11
Hypothesis 8 Results

		Attendance		
		Only one event	More than one event	Total
Class Standing	FR	691	245	936
	SO	319	107	426
	JR	186	52	238
	SR	180	33	213
	Total	1376	437	1813

Chi-Square value=11.729 df=3 $p \leq .05$

Null Hypothesis 9. No significant differences exist in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of their college of enrollment.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing the college of enrollment demographic characteristic and students who attended one programming board event versus students who attended more than one programming board event in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value of 9.00 (see Table 12). Since this value did not produce a significant difference at the .05 level, the researcher failed to reject null hypothesis 9. As the attendance numbers indicate, more students in every college attended only one event than students who attended more than one event.

Table 12
Hypothesis 9 Results

		Attendance		
		Only one event	More than one event	Total
College	College of Arts and Sciences	396	139	535
	College of General Studies	209	54	263
	College of Agriculture and Biological Sciences	208	61	269
	College of Engineering	194	69	263
	College of Nursing	149	44	193
	College of Family & Consumer Sciences	135	33	168
	College of Pharmacy	86	37	123
	College of Education and Counseling	12	2	14
Total		1389	439	1828
Chi-Square value=9.00		df=8	p>.05	

Null Hypothesis 10. No significant difference exists in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of on/off campus residence.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing the campus residency (on/off campus) demographic characteristic and students who attended one programming board event versus students who attended more than one programming board event in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value of 60.479 (see Table 13). Since this value produced a significant difference at the .0001 level, the researcher rejected null hypothesis 10. As the attendance numbers indicate, more on-campus students attended more than one event than off-campus students.

Table 13
Hypothesis 10 Results

		Attendance		
		Only one event	More than one event	Total
Residency	On-campus	907	340	1247
	Off-campus	472	94	566
Total		1379	434	1813

Chi-Square value=69.479 df=10 $p \leq .0001$

Null Hypothesis 11. No significant differences exist in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of home state.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing the home state demographic characteristic and students who attended one programming board event versus students who attended more than one programming board event in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value of 5.325 (see Table 14). Since this value did not produce a significant difference at the .05 level, the researcher failed to reject null hypothesis 11. As the attendance numbers indicate, on the characteristic of home state, students attended only one event at the same rate as they attend more than one event.

Table 14
Hypothesis 11 Results

		Attendance		
		Only one event	More than one event	Total
Home state	SD	886	263	1149
	MN	282	99	381
	IA	101	42	143
	Other	84	28	112
	NE	36	7	43
Total		1389	439	1828

Chi-Square value=5.325 df=4 p>.05

Null Hypothesis 12. No significant differences exist in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of ethnicity.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing ethnicity as a demographic characteristic and students who attended one programming board event versus students who attended more than one programming board event in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value of 9.794 (see Table 15). Since this value did not indicate a significant difference at the .05 level, the researcher failed to reject null hypothesis 12. As the attendance numbers indicate, based on ethnicity, students attended only one event at the same rate as students who attended more than one event.

Table 15
Hypothesis 12 Results

		Attendance		
		Only one event	More than one event	Total
Ethnicity	White	1247	388	1635
	Non-White	142	51	193
Total		1389	439	1828

Chi-Square value=9.749 df=7 p>.05

Research Question #3

Are there significant differences in the demographic characteristics of students who attend only entertainment events and those who attend only educational events?

A Pearson's Chi-Square test was utilized to address the third research question and the six hypotheses associated with the third research question.

Null Hypothesis 13. No significant difference exists between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of gender.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing the gender demographic characteristic and students who attended only entertainment programming board events versus students who attended only educational programming board events in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value with a Yates' correction of .438 (see Table 16). Since this value did not indicate a significant difference at the .05 level, the researcher failed to reject null hypothesis 13. As the attendance numbers indicate, in regards to gender, students attended educational events at the same rate as entertainment events.

Table 16
Hypothesis 13 Results

		Type of Event		
		Educational	Entertainment	Total
Gender	F	228	859	1087
	M	146	595	741
Total		374	1454	1828
Chi-Square value=.438		df=1	p>.05	

Null Hypothesis 14. No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of class standing.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing the class standing demographic characteristic and students who attended only entertainment programming board events versus students who attended only educational programming board events in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value of 17.126 (see Table 17). Since this value produced a significant difference at the .001 level, the researcher rejected null hypothesis 14. As the attendance numbers indicate, freshmen attended educational events at a higher rate than any other class standing.

Table 17
Hypothesis 14 Results

		Type of Event		
		Educational	Entertainment	Total
Class	FR	223	713	936
	SO	86	340	426
	JR	31	207	238
	SR	34	179	213
Total		374	1439	1813

Chi-Square value=17.126 df=3 $p \leq .001$

Null Hypothesis 15. No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of their college of enrollment.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing the college of enrollment demographic characteristic and students who attend only entertainment programming board events versus students who attended only educational programming board events in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value of 6.82 (see Table 18). Since this value did not indicate a significant difference at the .05 level, the researcher failed to reject null hypothesis 15. As the attendance numbers indicate, students did not attend educational events at a higher rate than entertainment events for the colleges represented.

Table 18
Hypothesis 15 Results

		Type of Event		
		Educational	Entertainment	Total
College	College of Arts and Sciences	115	420	535
	College of Engineering	57	206	263
	College of General Studies	49	191	240
	College of Agriculture and Biological Sciences	48	221	269
	College of Nursing	47	146	193
	College of Family and Consumer Sciences	33	135	168
	College of Pharmacy	18	105	123
Total		367	1424	1791
Chi-Square value=6.82		df=8	p>.05	

Null Hypothesis 16. No significant difference exists between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of on/off campus residence.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing for campus residency (on/off campus) demographic characteristic and students who attended only entertainment programming board events versus students who attended only educational programming board events in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a Chi-square value of 39.547 (see Table 19). Since this value produced a significant difference at the .0001 level, the researcher rejected null hypothesis 16. As the attendance numbers indicated, students that live on-campus attended educational events at a higher rate than students that live off-campus.

Table 19
Hypothesis 16 Results

		Type of Event		
		Educational	Entertainment	Total
Residency	On-campus	297	950	1247
	Off-campus	73	493	566
Total		370	1443	1813
Chi-Square value=39.547		df=10	$p \leq .0001$	

Null Hypothesis 17. No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of home state.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing for home state demographic characteristic and students who attended only entertainment programming board events versus students who attended only educational programming board events in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value of 2.641 (see Table 20). Since this value did not indicate a significant difference at the .05 level, the researcher to failed to reject null hypothesis 17. As the attendance numbers indicate, students did not attend educational events at a higher rate than entertainment events for the states represented.

Table 20
Hypothesis 17 Results

		Type of Event		
		Educational	Entertainment	Total
Home state	SD	227	922	1149
	MN	88	293	381
	IA	26	117	143
	Other	23	89	112
	NE	10	33	43
Total		374	1454	1828

Chi-Square value=2.641 df=4 p>.05

Null Hypothesis 18. No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of ethnicity.

A Pearson's Chi-Square test analyzing for ethnicity demographic characteristic and students who attended only entertainment programming board events versus students who attended only educational programming board events in the academic year 2008-2009 yielded a chi-square value of 4.719 (see Table 21). Since this value indicated a significant difference at the .05 level, the researcher rejected null hypothesis 18. As the attendance numbers indicated, students that identify as non-white attend educational events at a higher rate than students that identify as white.

Table 21
Hypothesis 18 Results

		Type of Event		
		Educational	Entertainment	Total
Ethnicity	White	323	1312	1635
	Non-White	51	142	193
Total		374	1454	1828

Chi-Square value=4.719 df=1 $p \leq .05$

Summary

Table 22 displays all of the demographic characteristics that yielded statistically significant differences with regard to event attendance.

Table 22
Summary of Findings

Research Question Composition	Demographic Characteristics	Classification Indicating Greater Attendance	Significance of Difference
Attendees vs. Non-Attendees	Gender	Female	$p \leq .0001$
	Class standing	Freshman	$p \leq .0001$
	College of enrollment	College of Arts and Sciences	$p \leq .0001$
	Campus residency	On-campus	$p \leq .0001$
	Ethnicity	Asian/Pacific Islander	$p \leq .0001$
Single vs. Multiple event attendance	Class Standing	Freshman	$p \leq .05$
	Campus residency	On-campus	$p \leq .0001$
Entertainment vs. Educational	Class standing	Freshman - Educational	$p \leq .001$
	Campus residency	On-campus - Educational	$p \leq .0001$
	Ethnicity	Non-white - Educational	$p \leq .05$

Chapter Five

Discussion

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to analyze selected demographic characteristics of students who attended programming board events at a medium size, four-year, public institution located in the upper Midwest and to assess whether there are statistically significant differences between attendees and non-attendees in the full-time undergraduate population. Six specific characteristics were analyzed: gender, class standing, college of enrollment, home state, on/off campus residency and ethnicity. By learning more about the characteristics of attendees at events, programming boards and various other student fee-funded programming entities will be better equipped to make informed programming decisions.

Discussion

Research Question 1. The first research question for the study was: Are the demographic characteristics of students who attend student fee-funded campus events significantly different from those of the general undergraduate population? The null hypotheses associated with research question number one were: (1) No significant difference exists between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of gender, (2) No significant differences exist between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of class standing, (3) No significant differences exist in event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of their college of enrollment, (4) No significant differences exist between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of on/off campus residence, (5)

No significant differences exist between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of home state, (6) No significant differences exist between event attendees and non-attendees on the basis of ethnicity. The data suggested that there were significant differences between event attendees and the undergraduate population on the basis of gender, class standing, college of enrollment, on/off campus residency and ethnicity. No significant difference between event attendees and the undergraduate population was found for home state. The results of the first research question were anticipated by the researcher. The literature discussed differences in gender, class standing, major within college of enrollment, campus residency (on/off campus) and ethnicity.

There were discrepancies in the literature based on the characteristic of gender. For the study, the researcher found that between attendees and non-attendees, there was a significant difference based on the characteristic of gender. The researcher found female students attend programming board events at a higher frequency than male students. Programming boards should be conscious of this knowledge when choosing which events to bring to campus and employ more targeted marketing efforts towards males to increase male attendance at programming board events.

In the literature, student involvement was particularly relevant for freshman students "during the transition from high school to college and university life, during which time changes and challenges in personal, academic, and interpersonal domains are common" (Busseri & Rose-Krasnor, 2008, p. 426). At the study institution, the researcher found that between attendees and non-attendees, there was a significant difference based on the characteristic of class standing. The research found that more freshman attend programming board events than any other class. The data showed that the frequency of

attendance decreased as students advance in class standing. However, a problem exists in keeping students as audience members as they advance. As students advance they may become more involved in academic organizations, internships, and work obligations therefore having less free time to attend a programming board event. Programming boards should work to provide a variety of programming options that appeal to all levels of class standing and provide programming at varying times of a day to accommodate more students' schedules. It is important to not only attract students when they first arrive on campus but to keep students as audience members as they progress through college.

Prior researchers discussed majors within colleges as relevant to their participation in student activities events. At the study institution, the researcher found that, between attendees and non-attendees, there was a significant relationship based on the characteristic of college of enrollment. The data showed that the largest college, the College of Arts and Sciences, had the highest attendance frequencies. However, surprisingly, the second largest college, the College of Agriculture and Biological Sciences, had the lowest attendance numbers of all colleges tested. The researcher expected to find some discrepancies between colleges because some colleges, based on the nature of the course material, require more study time outside of the classroom than other colleges. Also, some colleges may offer more opportunities for academic organization involvement compared to other colleges. However, the distribution of attendees and non-attendees across colleges was unexpected. The researcher expected the frequencies to correlate with college size. Programming boards should provide events focused on a variety of topics and subject matters to attract more students from

currently underrepresented colleges. For example, to attract more students from the College of Agriculture and Biological Sciences, programming boards could sponsor more events that appeal to students enrolled in that college such as a country singer/songwriter.

In the literature review, authors discussed campus residency and the many positive benefits of students living on campus. At the study institution, the researcher found that, between attendees and non-attendees, there was a significant relationship based on the characteristic of campus residency. Based on the literature, this finding was expected. "Simply by eating, sleeping, and spending their waking hours on the college campus, residential students have a better chance than do commuter students of developing a strong identification and attachment to undergraduate life" (Astin, 1984, p. 302). Although programming board events are highly attended by students that live on-campus, there is a sharp decrease in the attendance frequency of students that live off-campus. Students that live off-campus are more difficult to market events to because those students have a limited time on campus during the day. Programming boards need to work on effective marketing strategies to off-campus students. In addition, programming boards can provide events at varying times of day, such as in the morning or over the lunch hour, to catch more commuter students.

In the literature on student involvement, there was no discussion a students' home state and whether or not out-of-state or in-state residency affected students' involvement on campus. At the study institution, the researcher found that, of attendees and non-attendees, there was not a significant relationship based on the characteristic of home state. This finding was not expected by the researcher. Although no previous literature discussed the characteristic, the researcher expected students that were from out-of-state

would attend more events because they may have fewer opportunities to go home and would seek out more entertainment options on campus, such as those offered by a programming board.

In the literature review showed a positive relationship between ethnicity and on-campus involvement. Pike, Kuh, and Gonyea (2003) found being a member of a minority group was positively related to both academic and social involvement (p. 253). This finding was also true for the study institution. The researcher found that, of attendees and non-attendees, there was a significant relationship based on the characteristic of ethnicity. Again, programming boards should work to offer a variety of events to appeal to their diverse audience.

Research Question 2. The second research question for the study was: Do the students who attend more than one student fee-funded event have significantly different demographic characteristics from those who attend only one event? The six null hypotheses associated with research question number two were: (7) No significant difference exists in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of gender, (8) No significant differences exist in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of class standing, (9) No significant differences exist in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of their college of enrollment, (10) No significant difference exists in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of on/off campus residence, (11) No significant differences exist in students who attend one

student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of home state, (12) No significant differences exist in students who attend one student fee-funded event and those who attend multiple student fee-funded events on the basis of ethnicity. The data analysis found no significant differences between students who attend more than one student fee-funded event from those who attended only one event. However, there were significant differences between students who attended more than one student fee-funded event from those who attended only one event on the demographic characteristics class standing and campus residency (on/off campus).

The results of the second research question were not anticipated by the researcher. The literature did not discuss repetition of event attendance, however, the researcher speculated that demographic characteristics of students' who attended more programming board events would be significantly different from students that attended only one programming board event. The frequency of attendance at one event versus more than one event is the same for male and female students. Building an audience is important for the success of programming boards as they continue to offer more events further into the school year. Programming boards cannot depend on new attendees every time an event is put on. Eventually, events will start to fail for the lack of audience members. Failure to repeat attendance is a problem that appears in other demographic characteristic categories such as college of enrollment, home state, and ethnicity. It is important to build a relationship and a strong foundation of trust with an audience so students know that the programming board's events are quality events. Also, it is important so students continue to attend the programming board events, not only in that academic year, but also as they continue at the university.

The researcher found significant differences between students who attend more than one student fee-funded event from those who attend only one event on the demographic characteristics class standing and campus residency (on/off campus). Students with a freshman class standing attended more than one event at a higher frequency than any other class standing. This could be because freshman students are more aware of the events being marketed and have more free time to attend programming board events compared to other classes. Freshmen are also more likely to be a part of the on-campus category, which also attends more than one programming board events at a higher frequency than students who live off-campus. Students who live on-campus have more opportunities to learn about upcoming events and the students' proximity to event locations on campus makes it easier for on-campus students to attend events more frequently than students who live off-campus.

Research Question 3. The third research question for this study was: Are there significant differences in the demographic characteristics of students who attend only entertainment events and those who attend only educational events? The six null hypotheses for question number three were: (13) No significant difference exists between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of gender, (14) No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of class standing, (15) No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of their college of enrollment, (16) No significant difference exists between students who attend only

entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of on/off campus residence, (17) No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of home state, (18) No significant differences exist between students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend educational fee-funded events on the basis of ethnicity. The analysis demonstrated significant differences between students who attended only entertainment events and those who attended only educational events on the demographic characteristics class standing, campus residency (on/off campus) and ethnicity.

However, there were no significant differences between students who attended only entertainment events and those who attended only educational events on the demographic characteristics gender, college of enrollment, and home state. The researcher posits there was no significant difference based on gender because educational and entertainment events are appealing to both sexes. The researcher believed the variable, college of enrollment, might have been affected by students who only attended educational events versus students who only attend entertainment events, however, this was not the case. This finding suggests that students from every college are equally interested in entertainment and educational events. Throughout the study, home state remained an insignificant variable.

The results of the third research question were not anticipated by the researcher. There was no literature on types of events hosted by programming boards, however, the researcher speculated that demographic characteristics of students who attended only educational programming board events would be significantly different from students that

attended only entertainment programming board events. The analysis showed significant differences between students who attended only entertainment events and those who attended only educational events on the demographic characteristics class standing, campus residency (on/off campus) and ethnicity. This finding is important because the results show how students differ in the programming options they prefer. More freshmen attend a significantly higher proportion of only educational events than any other class standing. Higher Education Research Institute survey (2001) reported that 81% of first-year students had performed volunteer work in the past year. Since first-year students partake in a high percentage of volunteer opportunities, they may also be more likely to attend educational events to learn about social issues and other volunteer opportunities.

Additionally, students who live on-campus attend a significantly higher proportion of only educational events than off-campus students. On-campus students have more opportunities to learn about upcoming events and their proximity to event locations on campus make it easier for on-campus students to attend events more frequently than students who live off-campus.

Hu and Kuh (2002) found students of other racial and ethnic backgrounds were more likely than whites to be among those engaged in educationally purposeful activities…(p. 568). This was congruent with what this study found in that Non-White students attended only educational events at a higher proportion than White students. Programming boards need to offer a variety of events to satisfy the interests of the undergraduate student population.

Recommendations

The findings of this study revealed significant differences in demographic characteristics of attendees and non-attendees of programming board events, and significant differences in demographic characteristics of the students who attended only educational events versus those who that attended only entertainment events; however, there were few significant differences is demographic characteristics of students that attended one programming board event and students that attended more than one programming board event.

These findings and the lack of literature on programming boards support the need for more research on the full-time undergraduate student populations' attendance patterns at programming board events and their programming interests. The following recommendations for further research are suggested:

1. This study analyzed data from only one year. A study that includes multiple years and multiple institutions may be beneficial in producing a broad understanding of attendance patterns at programming board events and students' programming interests.
2. The findings from this research indicated that significant differences based on demographic characteristics of the type of events students attended. Further research into the different types of events programming boards sponsor and the attendance patterns of full-time undergraduate students at those events may assist programming boards in determining the events to bring to campus.
3. Additional research may address the responsibilities of programming board members at varying size institutions.

4. Research aimed at students' participation on programming boards may produce information by linking the length of time students serve on a programming board and the skills students learn from their participation on programming boards. Administrators can learn more about the effects of programming board involvement.
5. Additional research could be done on the structure of programming boards. By learning more about the structure of different programming boards, administrators can learn more about which structure fits their university the best and which structure is the most efficient in producing quality programming for their students.

Final Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to analyze selected characteristics of students who attended programming board events at a medium size, four-year, public institution located in the upper Midwest and assess whether there are statistically significant differences between attendees and non-attendees in the full-time undergraduate population. The specific characteristics analyzed included: gender, class standing, college of enrollment, home state, on/off campus residency and ethnicity. The study examined students who attended fee-funded programming events overall against the general population and then examined students who attended fee-funded programming events for frequency of attendance and type of events attended. Findings from this study include:

1. There were significant differences in demographic characteristics between attendees of programming board events and non-attendees. However, there was not a significant difference based on the characteristic of home state.

2. There were no significant differences in demographic characteristics between students who attend more than one student fee-funded event and those who attended only one programming board event. However, there were significant differences based on the characteristics of class standing and campus residency (on/off campus).
3. There were significant differences in the demographic characteristics of class standing, campus residency (on/off campus) and ethnicity, of students who attend only entertainment fee-funded events and students who attend only educational events. However, there were not significant differences based on the characteristics of gender, college of enrollment, and home state.

The results of this study suggest significant differences in the demographic characteristics of attendees and non-attendees of programming board events and significant differences in student demographic characteristics for the type of events students attend (entertainment versus educational). While these results suggest several ways in which attendance at events might be increased, additional qualitative and quantitative research is needed to further determine the nature and the extent of relationships between student demographic characteristics and event attendance, frequency of attendance, and types of events preferred.

References

Arboleda, A., Wang, Y., Shelley, M., & Whalen, D. (2003). Predictors of residence hall involvement. *Journal of College Student Development. 44*(4), pp. 517-531.

Astin, A.W. (1973). The impact of dormitory living on students. *Educational Record, 54*(3). pp. 204-210.

Astin, A.W. (1984). Student Involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*(4). pp. 297-308.

Astin, A.W. (1985). Involvement: The cornerstone of excellence. *Change, 17*(4). pp. 34-39.

Astin, A.W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years re-visited.* San Francisco: Jossy-Bass.

Astin, A.W. (1999). Student Involvement: A developmental theory for higher education**.** *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(5). pp. 518-529.

Berger, J. B., & Milem, J. F. (1999). The role of student involvement and perceptions of integration in a causal model of student persistence. *Research in Higher Education, 40,* pp. 641–664.

Busseri, M. & Rose-Krasnor, L. (2008). Subjective experiences in activity involvement and perceptions of growth in a sample of first-year female university students. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(5). pp. 425-442.

Chang, Sheue-Mei & Huang, Ya-Rong. (2004). Academic and co-curricular involvement: Their relationship and the best combinations for student growth. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(4). pp. 391-406.

Chickering, A. W. (1974). *Commuters* versus *residents.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fischer, M. (2007). Settling into campus life: Differences by race/ethnicity in college involvement and outcomes. *Journal of Higher Education, 78*(2). pp. 125-156.

Flowers, L. A. (2004). Examining the effects of student involvement on African American college student development. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(6). Pp. 633-654.

Gravetter, F. & Wallnau, L. (2009). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences eighth edition.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Higher Education Research Institute. (2001). *The American freshman: National norms for fall 2000.* Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles.

Hu, S., & Kuh, G. D. (2002). Being (dis)engaged in educationally purposive activities: The influences of student and institutional characteristics. *Research in Higher Education, 43*, pp. 555-575.

Jones, S. R. & Hill, K. E. (2003). Understanding patterns of commitment: Student motivation for community service involvement. *The Journal of higher Education, 74*(5). pp. 516-539.

Kezar, A. & Kinzie, J. (2006). Examining the ways institutions create student engagement: The role of mission. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(2). pp. 149-172.

Kinzie, J., Ward, K. & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2009). A tangled web of terms: The overlap and unique contribution of involvement, engagement, and integration to understanding college student success. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(4). pp. 407-428.

Kuh, G. (2001). *The National Survey of Student Engagement: Conceptual framework and overview of psychometric properties.* Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning. Retrieved from Google Scholar on November 20, 2010.

McMillan, J. (2008). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer.* Boston, MA. Pearson Education, Inc.

Lundberg, C. (2007). Student involvement and institutional commitment to diversity as predictors of Native American student learning. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(4). pp. 405-416.

North Carolina State University. (2009). *Quantitative research in public administration* (PA 765-766) Course Website. Retrieved on February 18, 2010, from http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/chisq.htm (last updated January 14, 2009).

Pace, C. R. (1984). *Measuring the quality of college student experiences: An account of the development and use of the college student experiences questionnaire.* Higher Education Research Institute, INC. Los Angeles, CA. pp. 1-139. Retrieved from Google Scholar on January 31, 2011.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pike, G., Kuh, G., Gonyea, R. (2003). The relationship between institutional mission and students' involvement and educational outcomes. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(2). pp. 241-261.

Pike, G. & Kuh, G. (2005). Typology of student engagement for American colleges and universities. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(2). pp. 185-209.

Preacher, K. J. (2001, April). Calculation for the chi-square test: An interactive calculation tool for chi-square tests of goodness of fit and independence [Computer software]. Available from http://quantpsy.org. Retrieved on March 28, 2011.

Skarkness, J. & De Angelo, L. (2010). Measuring student involvement: A comparison of classical test theory and item response theory in the construction of scales from student surveys. *Research in Higher Education,* pp. 1-28.

Appendix A

IRB Approval Letter

January 4, 2011

Kayla Person
Department of Educational Administration

James Griesen
Department of Educational Administration
125 TEAC, UNL, 68588-0360

IRB Number: 20110110884EP
Project ID: 10884
Project Title: A descriptive analysis of the 2008-2009 attendees of University Program Council events at South Dakota State University

Dear Kayla:

This letter is to officially notify you of the approval of your project by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects. It is the Board's opinion that you have provided adequate safeguards for the rights and welfare of the participants in this study based on the information provided. Your proposal is in compliance with this institution's Federal Wide Assurance 00002258 and the DHHS Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR 46). Your project was approved as an Expedited protocol, category 5.

You are authorized to implement this study as of the Date of Final Approval: 01/04/2011. This approval is Valid Until: 01/03/2012.

We wish to remind you that the principal investigator is responsible for reporting to this Board any of the following events within 48 hours of the event:
*Any serious event (including on-site and off-site adverse events, injuries, side effects, deaths, or other problems) which in the opinion of the local investigator was unanticipated, involved risk to subjects or others, and was possibly related to the research procedures;
*Any serious accidental or unintentional change to the IRB-approved protocol that involves risk or has the potential to recur;
*Any publication in the literature, safety monitoring report, interim result or other finding that indicates an unexpected change to the risk/benefit ratio of the research;
*Any breach in confidentiality or compromise in data privacy related to the subject or others; or
*Any complaint of a subject that indicates an unanticipated risk or that cannot be resolved by the research staff.

For projects which continue beyond one year from the starting date, the IRB will request continuing review and update of the research project. Your study will be due for continuing review as indicated above. The investigator must also advise the Board when

this study is finished or discontinued by completing the enclosed Protocol Final Report form and returning it to the Institutional Review Board.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB office at 472-6965.

Sincerely,

William Thomas, Ph.D.
Chair for the IRB

Appendix B

Event Descriptions

Table 23
Event Descriptions

Event	Event Description
CMN Kick-Off	An annual fall event used to promote CMN Dance-marathon. Attendees learn about the 12 hour event held in the spring and how and why to become involved.
A Night in the Box	A bluegrass, folk-rock band from Minneapolis, MN.
Battle of the Bands	An annual event comprised of 5-6 area bands competing for prize money. Audience votes determine the winner.
Cavorts	An annual university talent show on the Friday of homecoming week.
Miss Homelycoming	An annual reverse pageant where males compete as females to win the title of Miss Homelycoming.
CL Lindsay	A speaker who lectured on campus free speech and the importance of maintaining privacy on Facebook.
John Zaffis	A speaker who lectured on his extensive experience investigating paranormal activity throughout the world.
Maria Falzone	A speaker who lectured on safe sex.
Snowflake Skate	A annual event that offers free ice skating at the local ice skating arena.
Jym Elders	Mentalist and magician
Salish	Hypnotist.
Scratch Track	An acoustic, hip-hop soul group from Kansas City, MO.
Dancing with the Stars (Night 1 & 2)	A home-grown event based on the popular TV show "Dancing with the Stars" that uses skilled student dancers and popular personalities from campus.
Who Wants to be a Hundredaire	A home-grown event based on the popular TV show "Who Wants to be a Millionaire."